1: Honigmann E-5 (1943-1945) 1949 ND12 Nahane ND12

606 harassment than by the son-in-law's avoidance behavior. Even when intoxicated, Mrs. Man never relaxed in her reserve.

607 Between sisters' husbands, who call each other "brother," there is evidence of good friendship and some cooperation. Such brothers-in-law often hunt together and frequently visit each others camps. They also constitute trapping partnerships. Talk of a sexual nature is not supposed to occur in the brother-in-law's presence, because "he's married to my sister." Between a man and his wife's sister there is generally good natured interaction; a man may tease this woman, and she may offer to help him in some task requiring assistance, particularly when his wife is absent. Women avoid unnecessary intimacy with this relative. Thus Louisa Man returned a gun while only the ethnographer (classificatorily her sister's husband) and her brother-in-law, Hans Donnelly, were in the cabin. She would not enter but handed in the gun through the open door. During intoxication direct sexual approaches were several times attempted by Old Man's son-in-law toward this unmarried sister-in-law, Louisa. The latter firmly resisted their attention.

602 In general, the Kaska feel little need to phrase interpersonal relationships with non-
601 relatives in kinship terms. The reasons are apparent. Kinship in itself is of slight importance
551 in defining relations beyond the nuclear family, and the intimacy of wider social relations is governed by frequency of interaction. It is consistent, therefore, that only the most intense and persistent relations with non-relatives are marked by use of kinship terms. Non-relatives are most frequently classified as grandfather, brother, sister, and by the sibling-in-law terms; the son, daughter, and parent terms are avoided in such situations.

608 Several instances of artificial kin relationships were observed. If two persons of consider-
551 able age difference are thrown into association, the younger person may refer to the older by the grandfather term. The behavior toward this conventional grandparent may vary from respect to teasing. The older person himself is generally familiar and indulgent toward the artificial grandchild, whom he addresses by the given name.

609 In 1941 Old Man was lent to his daughter's husband's mother, Lolly Sam, who was
601 also his current wife's father's sister's son's wife. Old Man took to calling her "sister." All his daughters called her "grandmother."

When the ethnographer and his family became guests of Old Man they were also tentatively classified within the kinship system. The ethnographer's wife was called "older sister" by Old Man's daughters. This correlated with the expectation of matrilocal residence, in which a daughter brings her husband to her parents' settlement to live. The ethnographer logically became a son-in-law. The ethnographer's children were not called by kinship terms except once when Louisa Man addressed David (4) as "younger brother." The expected term here would have been *wu'* ("my sister's son").

Young men who are not related but are participating in a drinking party often address one another as "brother-in-law." As pointed out above, sibling terms may be used between sweethearts. When kinship terms are extended to non-relatives, they are almost always employed vocatively rather than referentially. A stepmother is referred to and addressed as "mother" and "mama."

551 Among men, between whom there is no relationship, the given name is generally used
604 as a term of address and either the given name or the full name as a term of reference. A man

1: Honigmann E-5 (1943-1945) 1949 ND12 Nahane ND12

refers to an unrelated married woman by the first name of the husband with the prefix "mama." Between two women, the given name is generally employed.

Larger Social Groups

Social organization beyond kinship is of slight functional significance in Kaska society and, even more than the kinship system, is largely of conceptual importance. The organization of the Kaska nation into tribes occupying loosely defined geographical districts has already been discussed.[7] There are four tribes known as the Frances Lake, Upper Liard River, Dease River, and Nelson Indians. The degree of emotional identification is relatively slight and would seem to be highest among the Upper Liard Indians. Here, however, relations between intertribal neighbors are, as we shall see, riddled by considerable supposed antagonism. Although there is a tendency to restrict marriage within tribal units, many marriages have taken place between these units with a consequent diffusion of tribal membership and identification.

No single pattern for determining membership in a specific district or tribe seems to obtain. Old Mary reported that a man belongs to the country of his father. He called himself a Liard River Indian, although his father was a Polly Indian and his mother belonged to the Liard River tribe. In general a person seems to belong to the tribal district or tribe in which he was born and raised, regardless of the tribe from which his parents originally came. This is not final, however. A man who changes his residence with marriage, generally becomes identified with the country in which he takes up residence and begins to trap. For a time, he continues to be referred to as belonging to the district from which he originally came. As his roots grow deeper in the adopted district, he begins to be identified with that tribe. Because of the frequent shifting of residence that occurred up to about thirty years ago, and the frequency of tribal intermarriage which still continues, the districts present a far from perfect correlation with tribal designation. For example, the bulk of families in the Frances Lake district are reported to have originally lived in the Upper Liard River region. Of the four family heads known as Upper Liard River Indians, only one was born in that region and his youth was spent in many parts of the total Kaska area.

Most of the Kaska Indians are divided into two territorial, matrilineal "sides" or moieties, the members of each of which feel vaguely related.[8] Although these sides are identified by the names of two animals, the Crow and Wolf respectively, there is little thought that a person has actually descended from a wolf or crow. Since neither of these two animals is customarily eaten, it is meaningless to talk of totemic food taboos. Both animals are readily killed, however, and the wolf is trapped for its fur as well as for the bounty paid on the pelt. The importance of the moiety is slight. Formal organization is lacking, there being no executives and no mechanisms to bring about the unified functioning of the group as a whole. The principal functions of the moiety lie in the regulation of mari-

[7] See above, pp. 130-33.

[8] Writing in 1928, Albert gives the impression of a number of unilateral kin groups. "The tribe," he says, in referring to the Kaska, "is divided into clans, such as Wolf (we yo-ahi), Crow (ganka), Bear (ani), etc." No evidence of more than two exogamous groups could be adduced. By the Bear "clan," Albert is probably referring to the Bear Lake Indians, who trapped up along the Muddy River and visited into Wolverine Creek and Lower Post. Albert, Notes on the Kaska and Upper Liard Indians (1928), 10.

1: Honigmann K-5 (1943-1945) 1949 ND12 Nahane ND12

431 which follow a request for assistance. The meat of large game animals is always readily distributed, even when a family is living with unrelated people. Other spontaneous gifts are made relatively rarely and then only in well defined cultural contexts. The most common of these presents include purchased trade goods, manufactures, such as moccasins, meat, berries, and furs. A few people exchange purchased trade goods at Christmas. Native manufactures may be given by a woman to her husband or brother. Spontaneous gifts, excepting meat, are frequently reciprocated within a few days or weeks and such reciprocity is usually expected, although not closely formulated. Hospitality may be recognized as a special form of free gift giving, but is not carried to excesses and few people want for any length of time without supplying their own grub. Persistent demands for hospitality are, first covertly and then more overtly, resented, since, particularly in the winter settlement, the supply of grub is limited and often barely enough to see a family through to spring.

More gifts follow a call for assistance. Such requests may be outright, but are more generally advanced by implication. It is far more satisfactory if a person has his alleged movement of being low on cuisine or moccasins fulfilled by a gift of such goods than if he has to request the objects directly. Although requests are commonly fulfilled, this is not necessarily done in a spirit of generosity and the evaluation of covert resentment operates to reduce calls for help. In return for his response, however, the donor enhances his reputation for generosity. Nevertheless this reputation does not be too widely advertised, for fear that it will boomerang in the form of additional requests. Actually more people were described to the ethnographer as being stingy than were praised for their generosity. The reluctance of most people to make demands for goods or grub, particularly to non-relatives, also prevents a person's generosity from being abused. It is more or less understood that following assistance, the recipient will reciprocate the favor when he is called upon to do so. Actually many people chronically seek help without being able to contribute anything but cooperation in return, and this they are usually very unwilling to offer. The result is that the onus of giving rests upon a few older men who have been able to accumulate food and goods and who are generally extremely resentful of the role in which they are placed. This antagonistic attitude itself is responsible for giving which in turn does not pass unnoticed and stimulates resentment in neighbors.

426 Loans differ from gifts in that they are made with the stronger expectation of the return of the object or its equivalent. Capital goods, as we have shown, are readily loaned. Grub, on the other hand, being more valuable, is more reluctantly shared in this fashion. Loans of money are occasionally made to someone with no interest being charged. It is not infrequent that loans fail to be repaid. Old Mike reported loaning skins to his son-in-law, Hans, who needed supplies but had no money. "I did it," Old Mike said, "but he never let me have a [buck]. If he stronger man, I broker him, but no use—he marry my daughter."

425 A final word may be added concerning the relatively rare instances of the destruction 768 of goods. This is limited to the wearing clothes of the deceased, which are burned or abandoned after death, the rationalization being that they may carry disease and in this way threaten the surviving members of a family. A tent in which death has occurred is also sometimes abandoned for the same reason. Food of any kind is never destroyed.

428 Inheritance. Like most of the property transactions already referred to, the processes of

1: Honigmann, E-6 (1943-1945) 1949 ND12 Nahane ND12

critical. He indirectly warned the ethnographer not to be taken in by River Joe's friendship, stating that River Joe quickly tired of people and then discarded them. Old Man periodically resented Joe's past criticism of the present Mrs. Man. According to Old Man, River Joe had wrecked on this marriage to an old woman and urged his former brother-in-law (Old Man had married sisters of River Joe's brother's wife) to find a young girl. Old Man expressed little sympathy with River Joe's widowhood, claiming that the latter had once called himself a Tahltan Indian, and why didn't he go to those people now in order to find a new woman. In his turn River Joe warned the ethnographer not to live with Old Man and compared his own settlement, with its clean, well floored houses, to Old Man's floorless buildings.

The same note was struck by Louis Man, who jeered at the poor accommodations which Old Man could offer the ethnographer and pointed proudly to his better quarters. Louis' attitudes were echoed by his partner, Peter Tom. Derogatory attitudes were expressed by Old Man regarding Louis Man. He said that out of meanness Louis was not allowing his partner, Peter, to live in the former's new home but was forcing the youth to sleep in an old tent frame. This appears to have been a total misconstruction of facts, since Peter had previously boasted that the tent frame would become his own when Louis moved into his new house.

We also heard Peter Tom criticize River Joe for turning against people who ate his grub. This antagonism may be explained by the fact that after having lived with one of Joe's daughters for a year, Peter found his plans to wed the girl legally frustrated by the older man's sudden change of mind. Peter also asserted that Hans Donnelly did not treat his wife well, forcing her to haul and cut wood. There is reason to believe that even a neighbor's economic hardship is often experienced as gratifying. An indication of this comes from the amusement with which members' news of poor luck in hunting and trapping is received in the winter settlements.

All of these illustrations come from one tribal district and show the character of the attitudes existing between close neighbors. Even within a single settlement there may be antagonism, especially if members of two evaluated or ethnically colored families live in proximity. Thus Harry Long accused his brother-in-law's, Hans, mother of having "talked" about him and thereby influenced Hans to build his own tent frame and cease sharing Harry's house.

One function of unexpressed hostility is to reduce any feeling of ingroup solidarity and thus to endlessly the economic social structure. Between people of different tribal districts even stronger antagonisms prevail. Such people are often referred to as strangers or as "different people." Thus one afternoon Louis Man expressed his suspicion that the people across the river were drinking a brew. He added, "We can see go over there. These different people. They never mean." Asked for his opinion about the Crow brothers, who were Nahane Indians, Old Man replied that he didn't know the Crow "bunch" but said that, according to Mary Wiley, who had lived with them as an adopted relative, they were "pretty hard to get along with and always talk about other people." He also reported River Joe's decision that the Nahane people were "no good." When Richard Day was asked his opinion of Edward Crow, he stated that the latter is disliked by many people. As he

1: Honigmann E-5 (1943-1945) 1949 ND12 Nahane ND12

604 578 577 186 would add by way of explanation was: "He lies." Later Richard added that he would not
associate with Edward for fear of imperiling his friendship with age mates. Even older
children show characteristic behavior toward companions from other districts. When
Donald Sam first appeared in Lower Post, after fourteen years spent at Frances Lake, a
number of youths approached and inspected him, calling him: "Stranger." They then
threatened to hurt him. Donald remained submissive. An hour or two later the same boys
had fully accepted the visitor. In these attitudes and behaviors toward members of con-
gruous and mutually intelligible Kaska tribes we see the beginnings of the ethnocentrism
which will be discussed in connection with intergroup relations. In a last analysis the true
ingroup among the Kaska is probably the nuclear family.

578 183 Any overt expression of hostility in quarrels and ingroup violence is rare. When people
are sober there is consistency between ideals and behavior so far as the control of aggression
is concerned. Even the possibility of inviting quarreling is forestalled by the fact that many
people are quick to flee from any such threatening situation. Although one or two dominant
and assertive men appear more ready to face disharmony, in general the pattern for both
sexes is rigorously to suppress and ignore all open expression of hostility.

Intoxication sometimes alters this picture. In this condition, a number of men show
readiness to revive old grudges and air antagonisms without fear of provoking violence. In
English, the drunken quarrelers hurl insults replete with obscenity at one another in an
attempt to provoke an initial act of violence. Before the mounting hostility can reach this
level, women with their young children have generally retreated to a safe distance. Often
578 579 185 the provocations to violence remain unaccepted by either party, and the quarrel peters out
in a less disguised exchange of insults. Sometimes, however, the challenge is taken up and
blows begin to be exchanged. While fists are used at first, this form of fighting soon yields
to wrestling, the aim being to throw the opponent and then choke him into surrender.
Weapons of any kind were never observed to be employed in quarrels. Sometimes a woman
will try to separate two men who are fighting, but generally women are too timid to venture
close. Old John was rather outstanding among men for his consistent tendency to forestall
aggression in beer drinks; he also broke up many fights. Antagonism following such quarrels
is rarely prolonged, although the resentment may continue covertly and motivate additional
aggression during a subsequent drinking party. Sometimes in intoxication a bullying type of
behavior appears. Louis Mam once manifested such behavior when he asked Nitla, a very
pacific youth, to wrestle him. Nitla immediately declined. Louis then rudely took away a
dipper of coffee which Nitla was drinking, but again the latter displayed no emotion.
Turning his attention elsewhere, Louis picked up a nearly empty tea pot and emptied the
grinds on Edward Prince, at the same time winking to the ethnographer. Edward ignored
the slight and remarked: "Must be raining." Only an hour or so previously, when both had
been much drunken, Edward and Louis had quarreled bitterly, but now Edward was sober-
ing up and refused the implicit challenge evident in Louis' behavior.

578 515 Family life is not characterized by quarreling. Ideally a man feels entitled to beat his
wife if he suspects that she has been untrue to him, but not all men avail themselves of this
permitted behavior. Several husbands (including Hans Donnelly, Edward Prince, and Louis
Mam) are noted for aggression toward wives when intoxicated. One such quarrel was ob-

1: Honigmann E-5 (1943-1945) 1949 ND12 Nahane ND12

522 picking up a slim volume containing a gospel. He solemnly crossed himself and spoke the Sign of the Cross in Kaska. His friends laughed riotously.

574 Customarily visits are never exchanged across sexual lines, but rather between members of the same sex. The only exception to this rule is the fact that an elderly man will sometimes visit a camp in which a mature woman lives alone. Men and women exchange visits throughout the day, but in Lower Post there was noted a tendency for a few women (including Mildred Lang and Marie Nolan) to limit their visits to after supper. [512]

574 Like most sociability, pleasure in visiting comes from social proximity rather than from conversation. Although individual loquacity varies, in general people tend to say little during a visit (to the discomfort of white hosts!), the situation often resembling a roomful of disparate individuals. This constraint is lacking when members of a family visit together but grows more pronounced when comparative strangers from outside the tribal district pay a call. 521 [609]

574 Hospitality is not expected as the necessary response of a host toward a visitor. In fall or winter, when visitors have come to the winter settlement from a long distance, tea is generally asked for or poured by the guest from the host's everfeady supply. If a traveler has brought no grub, he may be invited to eat (he is always free to help himself should there be meat in the host's camp), or he may, without shame, ask for food. A family coming to visit for sometime does not depend on such hospitality but brings its own grub, meat, and blankets. Before this food supply has been exhausted the guests will probably be gone.

576 Visitors enter a house or tent without signaling although Indians usually rap before entering a white man's cabin or speak upon approaching his tent. Formalities do not always mark the end of a visit. While some men have adopted the white pattern of calling a farewell, most people ignore this nicety and silently take their departure. A certain etiquette marks a visit which is directed toward making a request or borrowing something. Upon entering the house, the visitor stands quietly for a few minutes, perhaps paying attention to the host's children. Then the business matter of the visit is stated and when it is settled, departure is in order. If the call is made in order to return a borrowed object, like a plate, the guest always remains for several minutes after the transaction has been completed.

273 *Formal.* Beer or wine is generally made, or liquor purchased, with the intention of sharing it with close friends at a drinking party. A man is always host at such parties, which may be held in a tent or cabin or, for safety from the police, in the brush a short distance away from Lower Post. Guests are usually limited to members of the host's tribe, who have been selected by factors of reciprocity and congeniality. Occasionally a white man joins an Indian beer drink. Solitary drinking is unknown, if beer, wine, or liquor is available in quantities of a quart or more.

Everyone drinks from the same cup. The host dips the cup into the liquid (which is never strained) and hands a helping to each guest. In the case of bottled liquor, the bottle is passed around the company starting with the host. Sometimes an after-shave preparation or hair tonic is mixed with beef-iron stomach tonic and a few ounces served to each visitor in a cup. With few exceptions an Indian drinker, man or woman, drains his cup without once removing it from his mouth. The style of slow drinking (that is, sipping interspersed with conversation) is referred to as "white man's drinking" and, although encouraged by a

1: Honigmann E-5 (1943-1945) 1949 ND12 Nahane ND12

157 of potency failure which conditions their attitudes toward sex,* among the Kaska this dan-
181 ger is made particularly severe, first, by the threat of intercourse to a personality directed
836 toward emotional aloofness and, second, by the chronic readiness to expect failure in any emotional crisis. Men, therefore, are ambivalent about taking the lead in sex activities do so, as in rape and mock rape, with real or symbolic aggression, which is supposed to reaffirm their sense of mastery.

157 The unconscious definition of the sexual act, derived from dreams and associations,
181 confirms the impression of the sexual situation as a kind of mock rape. A typical dream of
831 being pursued, similar to others several times reported by girls, comes from Marie Nolan.
787

6:30:45 (Lower Post). "Night before I went to sleep. Tom [her white husband] came home twelve o'clock. I said: 'I dream that somebody come to my camp. Who are you?' He said: 'Me.' I get scared and I start to get up. He grabbed me. He said: 'What are you trying to do?' Then I woke up. He said I start to fight him."

Asked whom she thought came into the camp, Marie said she suspected it was a soldier. She was invited to talk about soldiers and revealed that on the evening preceding the dream she had been at the restaurant when one of a group of American soldiers encountered her and tried to lure her into a truck with the promise of a drink. Marie, however, ran away. She was asked to
● [409] say something more about soldiers. "These soldiers American, but I don't know who they are. I like American people. They're always fine people. I like white people. I always liked them. It must be because there's half-white blood in mine." She admitted that she had always wanted to be like white people and pointed out, with some pride, that her name did not appear on the Indian census rolls.

Marie's dream expresses an ambivalent fear of sexual attack. The fact that the dream occurs simultaneously with her husband's entrance into the camp is significant, since the dream thereby juxtaposes the white solider and Marie's white husband. Further evidence of ambivalence toward the central idea of the dream, coitus, is revealed in her association to American people, whom she likes, and white people, with whom she identifies.

A somewhat similar dream was reported by eleven year old Elsie Lang.

11:30:45 (Old Man's place). "I dream soldier—they drunk." The scene of the dream was Lower Post, where the soldiers pursued Elsie who sought to escape by fleeing down the cutbank.

Elsie is too young esgr to have had sexual intercourse, but the dream may be interpreted as indicating her awareness of this behavior and expresses her dread of, and probably her wish for, the experience. The same girl reported recurrent dreams of running away from attacking dogs.

Eva Ardo admitted a series of dreams reflecting fear of attacks by animals and indicating the unconscious sexual significance of animal dreams.

6:25:45 (Lower Post). "I scared when I dream beaver. If somebody kill him, I never scared beaver. . . . Everytime, that's my dream—otter, mink, beaver. That's all. Is same boy, that otter. Then he come with me and catch me pretty near. I scared. I get away. That mink just the same boy too. Same way I see grizzly bear too. Just the same like a man. Is white man. I scared that grizzly bear. I scared black bear too."

* Fromm, Sex and Character (1941), 24.